

creating a conflict between Śrīla Prabhupāda's opinion and our previous *ācārya*'s opinions regarding Sunīti's character and position. Instead of reconciling the apparent conflicting opinions between our *ācāryas*, the author out of sheer hatred for Vedic culture and Vedic personalities chose to speculate on a mental platform thereby only confusing the devotees.

The author is also guilty of violating his statements of loyalty to Śrīla Prabhupāda's words being as good as or greater than *śāstra*, not requiring harmonization with *śāstra*, and as good as the statements of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Based on the evidence provided herein exposing the author's unjustifiable and unwarranted twisting of the statements of Śrīla Prabhupāda, his diligence to adhere his own principle is certainly questionable. The readers may recollect the author's statement – "thence there is no need to harmonize Śrīla Prabhupāda's words against *śāstra*" – and relate it to the author's well-engineered lexical sleight of the hand. What else does such a demonstration of unethical scholarship reveal other than a vicious plan of the author to keep ISKCON devotees in ignorance regarding the actual scriptural injunctions against the implementation of FDG?

Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura's *dikṣā* lineage controversy

Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura is the *Gauḍīya-sampradāya pravartaka* or the one who re-established the authentic *Gauḍīya* philosophy and practices. This includes discovering the actual place of appearance of Lord Caitanya. The widespread prevalence of numerous controversies and misappropriations of *Gauḍīya-siddhata* is an irrefutable fact. Notwithstanding that, there are several misconceptions that are prevailing even today in devotee circles of the *Gauḍīya-sampradāya* regarding understanding the exact position of Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura. Śrīla Ṭhākura's *dikṣā* lineage has been a hugely controversial

topic for many years, more so now, in light of devotees within ISKCON, determined to implement FDG, trying to desperately establish the authenticity of the FDG system by somehow establishing a link with Śrīla Ṭhākura's *dikṣā* lineage.

Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura's *dikṣā* lineage and ISKCON connection:

The author states without citing any concrete evidence that Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura did not reject his *dikṣā-guru* Bipina Bihārī Goswami (and vice-versa). The author also argues that Bipina Bihārī Goswami did not subscribe to caste-goswami or *apasampradāyic* conceptions. On page 33 of his book, the author states:

There is no written evidence by Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura himself that he ever rejected or even disrespected Bipin Bihārī Goswami [45] – page 33

[45] <https://harekrsna.com/sun/editorials/05-06/editorials344.htm>

The author relies heavily on a reference to another article, written by Madhavananda Das, published on the internet to emphatically state that “There is no written evidence by Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura himself that he ever rejected or even disrespected Bipina Bihārī Goswami.” However, in that article, the author failed to notice a major ambiguity or even a major concern, which is explained below:

As the followers of Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Thakur, we accept Śrīla Jagannath Das Babaji as the siksa and prominent guru of Thakur Bhaktivinode. However, it is only fair to note that no where in his writings does the Thakur himself say this. The only written statements that we are aware of by Thakur Bhaktivinode about Śrīla Jagannath Das Babaji appear in sections 373, 375, and 366-367 of his autobiography. Therein Bhaktivinode speaks of his service to Jagannath Das and makes his reverence towards him very clear. **However, he never refers to him as guru.**²⁸

28 <https://tinyurl.com/2pmhdwta>

It seems that Madhavananda Das, raises an unwarranted doubt in the minds of the readers by speculating whether it is fair enough to accept as it is the disciplic succession from Śrīla Jagannātha Dās Bābājī as given by Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura and propagated later on by Śrīla Prabhupāda. The referenced author implicitly creates an unwarranted conflict between the statements of Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura and that of Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura regarding the position of Śrīla Jagannātha Dās Bābājī. The author of the book under discussion, due to his obsession to implement FDG within ISKCON at any cost only, tries to exploit, to his fullest advantage, the above referenced article regarding the controversy concerning Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura's *dīkṣā* lineage. Continuing with the book under discussion:

Lastly, and most importantly, while few doubt that there was a disagreement and consequent alienation between Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura and Bipina Bihārī Goswami on substantial grounds later in their relationship, — even if it finally led to a formal rejection of the guru by the disciple (or vice versa), how could that by itself invalidate the entire paramparā founded by Jāhnavā-devī that they both belonged to? — pages 34

The argument of whether a break in a disciplic succession renders the previous *sampradāya ācāryas* invalid is not new but a common and popular one, often put forward by devotees with a pro-FDG stand. This is particularly in light of the controversy surrounding Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura rejecting Bipina Bihārī Gosvāmī. Ofcourse a break in the disciplic succession of a *dīkṣā* lineage does not invalidate the predecessor gurus of that *dīkṣā-paramparā*. However, whether a break in the *dīkṣā* lineage of Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura renders female *dīkṣā-gurus* of that lineage invalid or not is irrelevant to ISKCON because the fact of the matter is that ISKCON devotees adopt the principles of and follow Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura through the *śikṣā-paramparā* as given by Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura and Śrīla

Prabhupāda, and not the Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura's *dikṣā* lineage.

In Bhagavad-gītā 4.2, Lord Kṛṣṇa states that the *paramparā* will be lost when a link in the chain of disciplic succession breaks. In the next verse (4.3), He says that after some time of *yoga-naṣṭaḥ* or a break in the disciplic succession, the Lord is re-establishing the lost link via Arjuna.²⁹ Similarly, the creation of a *paramparā* of Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura via the medium of Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura and Śrīla Prabhupāda validates the following:

- There existed a period of *yoga-naṣṭaḥ* (caste-goswamis and *apasampradāya*) before and during the time of Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura. This is confirmed by the monumental writings of Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura condemning the wholesale deviations from Gauḍīya-siddhānta
- The Lord chose Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura, pure devotee of the Lord, to re-establish the proper link to *Bhakti-siddhānta* coming from Śrīla Jagannātha Dās Bābājī and ultimately to us through Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura and Śrīla Prabhupāda.

śikṣā-paramparā vs. dikṣā-paramparā

Hence, as far as the followers of Gauḍīyas, including ISKCON devotees, are concerned, Lord Kṛṣṇa's *mārga-darśana* or instructions about the path of perfection continues to flow through the *śikṣā-paramparā* of Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura as given by Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura. Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura also gave the *dikṣā-paramparā* for ISKCON through the *vaiṣṇava-dikṣā* process based on the *Nārada-pāñcarātra*. This method of *dikṣā* is based on the *pañca-saṁskāra* process involving five processes of purification such as *tāpa*, *puṇḍra*, *nāma*, *yāga*, and *mantra*. This method of initiation is based on the *pāñcarātrikī-vidhī* which is quite different from *siddha-praṇālī*, the process of initiation

²⁹ See also *Bhagavad-gītā* 4.1 purport

followed in the *dīkṣā* lineage of Śrīla Lalita Prasād Ṭhākura, brother of Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura.

The author intentionally makes personal attacks on the guru-disciple relationship of a particular devotee by name:

For instance, does XXX Prabhu's official and public rejection of his own spiritual master, XXX Goswami, on philosophical and doctrinal grounds invalidate, by the same token, the dīkṣā-paramparā that the latter belongs to? And why shouldn't the obvious answer "no" to this question equally apply to the dīkṣā-paramparā of Bipin Bihārī Goswami? – pages 34, 35

Although, on pages 34 and 35 of his book, the author tries to draw parallels between XXX devotee's relationship with his initiating spiritual master and that of Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura's relationship with his guru, the author merely speculates and engages in a strawman argument because the actual point is that it was Lord Kṛṣṇa's desire to re-establish the broken link to *Bhakti-siddhānta* paramparā via Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura.

Whether Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura rejected Bipina Bihārī Goswami or not (or vice versa), that alone one cannot determine whether the intermediate gurus are *apasampradāya* or not. Leaving that aside for a moment, in no ways can ISKCON devotees take guidance from the teachings of Śrīla Lalita Prasād Ṭhākura because Śrīla Prabhupāda forbade us from taking guidance from him.³⁰ Even though Śrīla Prabhupāda respected Śrīla Lalita Prasād Ṭhākura he did not agree with all his teachings and philosophy. Hence, we have to accept the *mārga-darśana* of Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura as shown to us by Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura and Śrīla prabhupāda and refrain from bypassing them to seek precedence or shelter in Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura's *dīkṣā* lineage. That brings us to the next important question: how Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta

30 Letter to: Acyutananda, Dated: July 29, 1972, Amsterdam

Sarasvatī Ṭhākura's conclusions on caste-goswamis and their *apasampradayas* reconcile this controversy?

Only Bhaktisiddhānta can give Bhaktisiddhānta

Studying the teachings and activities of Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura helps us to understand the crux of this controversy and also a great insight into our glorious paramparā that is coming from the teachings of Śrīla Rūpa Goswami and his followers, Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura, and Śrīla Gaura Kīśora dāsa Bābājī Mahārāj.

Validity of siddha-praṇālī

In this section, we will refute the author's argument regarding *siddha-praṇālī*, made on pages 27 and 28 of his book.

If Śrīla Prabhupāda's rejection of siddha-praṇālī in NOD 16 as "a manufactured way... followed by the prākṛta-sahajiyā pseudosect of so-called Vaiṣṇavas" is indeed as blanket as you seem to ... would also invalidate Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura's detailed description of the process of siddha-praṇālī in Harināma-cintāmaṇi and Jaiva-dharma...

Moreover, your interpretation of Śrīla Prabhupāda's dismissal of siddha-praṇālī puts him at odds with his spiritual master, and you — with yours. Bhakti Vikāśa Swami writes in Śrī Bhaktisiddhānta Vaibhava: - pages 27, 28

It should be obvious to you that like Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī, by the "so called siddha-praṇālī ... followed by the prākṛta-sahajiyā pseudosect" Śrīla Prabhupāda criticized not the authorized practice followed by Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura and predecessors in his line, including the three Gosvāminīs but "its widespread misappropriation – page 30

Let us recollect from one of the previous sections the stand taken by the author with regards to accepting the statements of Śrīla Prabhupāda, which were:

- 1a. Equal to or in some cases even greater than śāstrās
- 1b. Thence: no need to harmonize his statements with śāstrās.

1c. Thence: must be followed even if and when their instructions cannot be readily verified by śāstrās.

So, on pages 27 through 30 of his book, excerpts from which presented above, it is clear that the author is not serious about following his principle of accepting Śrīla Prabhupāda's statements without attempting to harmonize them with other authoritative source but is merely a fault-finder. If he states that Śrīla Prabhupāda is the highest authority then what is the difficulty in accepting Śrīla Prabhupāda's statements from NOD chapter 16, that "The *siddha-praṇālī* process is followed by a class of men who are not very authorized and who have manufactured their way of devotional service," as it is without any interpretations. Why should the author interpret Śrīla Prabhupāda's words to say that he meant only "its widespread misappropriation?"

In addition to that on pages 27 and 28 of his book, why does the author attempt to harmonize Śrīla Prabhupāda's statements of, "so-called *siddha-praṇālī*," with Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura's detailed description of the process of *siddha-praṇālī* in *Harināma-cintāmaṇi* and *Jaiva-dharma*? Why is the author not satisfied with his stated principle that Śrīla Prabhupāda's statements are already in harmony with scriptures and that it does not require any harmonization with external scripture such as *Harināma-cintāmaṇi*, *Jaiva-dharma*, or even for that matter *Śrī Bhaktisiddhānta Vaibhava*? In other words, according to the three principles of the author that he has imposed upon others, accepting NOD chapter 16 "as it is" and not attempting to harmonize it with external scriptures, means that the only conclusion one can come to is that *siddha-praṇālī* is not a bonafide process.

Śrī Bipina Bihārī Goswami – caste goswami connection

On page 33, the author raises objections regarding a statement made by his opponents, as cited below:

As far as your conjecture that since Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura “declared the caste goswamis as an *apasampradāya*”, therefore he himself belonged to one — that would necessarily imply that Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura also willfully propagated the same “*apasampradāya*” as he gave initiations into the same *dikṣā* line to his son Lalitā Prasāda and a few other disciples. There is no written evidence by Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura himself that he ever rejected or even disrespected Bipin Bihārī Goswami, neither were disciples of Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura ever classified or rejected by Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura as belonging to an *apasampradāya* on the basis of their initiation into the same *dikṣā* line. – page 33

It is not clear whether the author, although well conversant with Gauḍīya scriptures is aware that *jāta-gosāṇi* and caste goswamis are referring to the same or whether he is aware of the fact that Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura rejected *jāta-gosāṇi* or caste goswamis as being one of the thirteen groups identified as *apasampradāya* as communicated by Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura and Śrīla Prabhupāda.³¹ It is very clear from the numerous writings of Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura and Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura that they both rejected the ideas propagated by caste goswamis as *apasampradāya* ideas although out of respect and etiquette they did not name specific cast goswami families. In the next passage on page 33 of his book, the author defends Bipina Bihārī Goswami against any accusations that he belonged to an *apasampradāya* (our addition is marked within curly braces):

Not only that but one would expect the writings of an “*apasampradāya*” guru such as Bipina Bihārī Goswami to be also tinged with deviations and as such, unacceptable for pure devotees. However, as Bhakti Vikāśa Swami writes in Śrī Bhaktisiddhānta Vaibhava {vol3, p344}:

31 Many other methods of worshipping Caitanya Mahāprabhu have also been introduced but they have all been rejected by stalwart devotees like Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura. The groups practicing such unauthorized worship have been listed by Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura: *āula*, *bāula*, *kartābhajā*, *neḍā*, *daraveśa*, *sāṇi*, *sahajiyā*, *sakhibhekī*, *smārta*, *jāta-gosāṇi*, *ativāḍī*, *cūḍādhārī*, *gaurāṅga-nāgarī* – [Cc Antya 14.7 purport]

“Arcana procedures given by Śrīla Sarasvatī Ṭhākura for the Gaudīya Maṭha were based largely on the extensive directions given in Śrī Bipina Bihārī Goswami's Hari-bhakti-taraṅgiṇī, and also incorporated those of Hari-bhakti-vilāsa and the Saṅkṣepa-arcana-paddhati (Abridged system of worship) given by Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura at the end of his Bhajana-rahasya. (...) In his preface to Hari-bhakti-taraṅgiṇī, Śrī Bipina Bihārī Goswami acknowledged Śrī Siddhānta Sarasvatī's having edited that work. Even after Śrī Bipina Bihārī's demise, the Gaudīya continued to advertise Hari-bhakti-taraṅgiṇī.” – pages 33, 34

This passage from Śrī Bhaktisiddhānta Vaibhava, page 344 is in regards to the *arcana* procedures of the Gaudīya Maṭha given by Śrīla Sarasvatī Ṭhākura and is not connected with Śrī Bipina Bihārī's philosophical views. The author extracted one passage from a multi-volume book, “Śrī Bhaktisiddhānta Vaibhava,” and quoted it out of context in order to achieve his agenda. To establish the theory that because Śrīla Sarasvatī Ṭhākura used a work of Śrī Bipina Bihārī, manual on Deity worship that Sarasvatī Ṭhākura himself edited, that this is proof that Śrī Bipina Bihārī could not have subscribed to *apasampradāya* ideas shows the magnitude of the author's stretch of imagination. Incidentally, when we referred to an excerpt from the section titled “The Bālighāi Showdown” from chapter 2 of Śrī Bhaktisiddhānta Vaibhava (vol I), cited below (emphasis ours), we found evidence to indicate the *apasampradāya* or *jāta-gosāñi* inclinations of Śrī Bipina Bihārī:

In August 1911, suspending their mutual mistrust, the *smārta-brāhmaṇas* and caste Goswamis arranged a meeting at Sujangar village, in Midnapore District of Bengal. Under the chairmanship of Śrī Bipina Bihārī Goswami they declared their anti-devotional manifesto, soon thereafter published as Pūrva-pakṣa Nirāsane (Refutation of the opposing argument): Unless born in a brāhmaṇa family, a Vaiṣṇava is disqualified from worshiping śālagrāmaśilā and conferring initiation. By accepting disciples, Narottama dāsa Ṭhākura and Śyāmānanda Prabhu had thus contravened śāstra;

Caitanya Mahāprabhu presented Raghunātha dāsa Gosvāmī with a Govardhana-śilā because as a śūdra he was disqualified from śālagrāma-śilā worship;

Worship of Govardhana-śilā has no śāstrīya basis and hence is merely conventional or sentimental;

Only those injunctions of *Hari-bhakti-vilāsa* that do not contradict traditional smṛtis are to be followed.³²

There is enough evidence that shows that Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura did not subscribe to the views of Śrī Bipina Bihārī Goswami and that he rejected both his *jāta-gosāñi* conceptions and the August 1911 resolution passed under his chairmanship. Though he did not counter the august 1911 resolution, he fully supported, guided, encouraged, and motivated his son Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura to participate in “The Bālighāi Showdown,” to thoroughly expose the apasampradāya concepts of Śrī Bipina Bihārī Goswami.³³

Although out of vaiṣṇava cultural etiquette Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura did not openly oppose and reject Śrī Bipina Bihārī Goswami, there are numerous writings in which he rejected the caste goswami conceptions. In addition, recent scholarly research regarding the controversy surrounding the *dīkṣā* lineage of Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura shows evidence that Bipina Bihārī Goswami rejected Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura.³⁴

Rejection of the *Nārada-Pāñcarātra Bharadvāja-saṁhitā*

In this section, we respond to some of the key objections raised by the author against the *Bharadvāja-saṁhitā*. Our interest is in responding only to the prominent objections and not to all

32 “Śrī Bhaktisiddhānta Vaibhava (vol I),” Bhakti Vikāsa Swami, chapter 2 pages 43, 44

33 See footnote reference: “Śrī Bhaktisiddhānta Vaibhava (vol I),” Bhakti Vikāsa Swami, chapter 2 pages 45

34 See article available at <https://tinyurl.com/y53yf65h>

of them since our goal is to establish the authenticity of the *Bharadvāja-saṁhitā* as one of the bonafide Vaiṣṇava scriptures that has been referred to by our previous *ācāryas* of our *sampradaya*, including Śrīla Prabhupāda.

Bharadvāja-saṁhitā: a hitherto unreferenced śāstra by our ācāryas?

On pages 179 through 182, the author states:

(a:) Do you accept that Śrīla Prabhupāda is no less empowered than Īśvara Purī and thus “should be considered as good as the Supreme Personality of Godhead Himself”? (b:) If you do, then why obscure and eclipse this position by one’s own imaginative interpretations of hitherto largely unreferenced *śāstras* in a presumptuous attempt to “harmonize” Śrīla Prabhupāda’s “conflicting statements” —and then educate his trusted direct disciples that they have had it wrong all along? – pages 181

The author, on page 181 of his book, cites an excerpt from a passage of the purport to Cc *Madhya* 10.136, which states that Śrīla Īśvara Purī was an empowered spiritual master as good as the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Nonetheless, in point (a) of the above cited excerpt from page 181 of his book, it is unclear why the author attempts to draw parallels between the position of Śrīla Prabhupāda with that of Īśvara Purī. Although the author stresses the supremacy of Śrīla Prabhupāda to be the same as that of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, he does seem to indicate that Śrīla Prabhupāda is greater than the *Nārada-pāñcarātra Bharadvāja-saṁhitā*. Moreover, he also minimizes the importance and derides the authenticity of the *Nārada-pāñcarātra Bharadvāja-saṁhitā* by categorizing this scripture as hitherto largely unreferenced *śāstra*. This violates etiquette and the standards of *guru-paramparā* since the author’s interpretation does not match the mood and desire of Śrīla Prabhupāda as he has expressed in his purport to SB 4.12.33 (cited below, emphasis ours) as to how he wishes himself to be seen by the rest of the world including his followers:

The conclusion is that a disciple or an offspring who is a very strong devotee can carry with him to Vaikuṇṭhaloka either his father, mother or śikṣā- or dikṣā-guru. Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura used to say, “If I could perfectly deliver even one soul back home, back to Godhead, I would think my mission — propagating Kṛṣṇa consciousness — to be successful.” The Kṛṣṇa consciousness movement is spreading now all over the world, and **sometimes I think that even though I am crippled in many ways, if one of my disciples becomes as strong as Dhruva Mahārāja**, then he will be able to carry me with him to Vaikuṇṭhaloka. [SB 4.12.33 purport]

The spiritual master is indeed respected and treated as good as the Supreme Personality of Godhead, nonetheless, service to the spiritual master must be in alignment with the teachings and desire of the spiritual master and not based on mental speculations or sentimental basis or even worse, ulterior motives. Śrīla Prabhupāda himself desires to strictly follow in the footsteps of his spiritual master.

Close examination of the author’s views expressed as part of point (b), on page 181 of his book, makes it clear that the ulterior motive of the author is to minimize and deride the *Nārada-pāñcarātra Bharadvāja-saṁhitā* as an unauthorized scripture. This also indicates that the author wants devotees to avoid any references to or harmonizations with that scripture. The author repeatedly insists on not harmonizing Śrīla Prabhupāda’s statements contained in the SB 4.12.32 purport with any scriptures including the *Nārada-pāñcarātra Bharadvāja-saṁhitā*. Such an adamant attitude on the part of the author only ignores Śrīla Prabhupāda’s purport to Cc *Madhya* 20.352 where he instructs his disciples and followers to keep *śāstra* at the center of all and to keep *śāstra* as the harmonizing factor for *guru-vākyas* and *sādhū-vākyas*. Furthermore, does the author’s statement about the *Bharadvāja-saṁhitā* being an unreferenced *śāstra*, not discredit the works of all our previous *ācāryas* who have referenced this scripture in their writings? In the introductory

section of our book, we have already shown evidence of the endorsement of the *Bharadvāja-saṁhitā* by gauḍīya ācāryas and by Śrīla Prabhupāda who considered the *Bharadvāja-saṁhitā* an important scripture containing important quotations regarding *vaiṣṇava-dīkṣā* based on *pāñcarātra-mārga* that ISKCON subscribes to. Śrīla Prabhupāda even advised his followers to use *Bharadvāja-saṁhitā* as the reference scripture in his purport to SB 4.31.10. Hence, it is not true that Śrīla Prabhupāda made only one passing reference to the *Bharadvāja-saṁhitā*, and therefore it is an obscure *śāstra* irrelevant to ISKCON, as the author and his camp want the devotee community to believe.

Śrīla Prabhupāda has made numerous references to *pāñcarātra-vidhi* in his purports (Cc *Madhya* 15.108, Cc *Ādi* 8.7, SB 4.2.28, and SB 5.9.10 to name a few).³⁵ The *Bharadvāja-saṁhitā* is part and parcel of the *Nārada-Pāñcarātra*, the source of *pāñcarātra-vidhi*, as has been established in the introductory sections of this writing. Hence, to state that *Bharadvāja-saṁhitā* is an obscure *śāstra* irrelevant to ISKCON is blasphemy (*śāstra-ninda*).

Is it because the author and his camp are not familiar with the *Bharadvāja-saṁhitā* that they dared to classify it as a largely hitherto unreferenced scripture? In light of so many discrepancies exposed in previous sections of our book, it is hard to give the benefit of the doubt to the author's motive as being benign or genuine. It has also been demonstrated in previous sections of this book that the credibility of the author and his works fails the "grain of rice" test, especially in light of the exposure of his motive to divorce Śrīla Prabhupāda's teachings, especially the purport to SB 4.12.32 from the teachings of the *Nārada-pāñcarātra Bharadvāja-saṁhitā*.

35 "Therefore, **this Kṛṣṇa consciousness movement has been started not only for the inhabitants of Bhārata-varṣa but for all the people of the world**, as announced by Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu. There is still time, and if the inhabitants of Bhārata-varṣa take this movement of Kṛṣṇa consciousness seriously, the entire world will be saved from gliding down to a hellish condition. **The Kṛṣṇa consciousness movement follows the process of pāñcarātrika-vidhi and that of bhāgavata-vidhi simultaneously**, so that people can take advantage of the movement and make their lives successful. – [SB 5.9.10 purport]"

The author's insistence that others accept Śrīla Prabhupāda as no less empowered and as good as the Supreme Personality of Godhead and to accept his words as *śāstras* themselves that do not need to be harmonized with other scriptures seems to be mere lip service. The evidence that we have provided in prior sections of this book and the more to come in the following sections only proves that the author's so-called glorification of Śrīla Prabhupāda is not only questionable but seemingly disingenuous.

Nārada-pāñcarātra Bharadvāja-saṁhitā – relevance to ISKCON

In this section, we discuss and refute more arguments of the FDG proponents which ignore the *śāstras* that prohibit women from becoming *dikṣā-gurus*. This is regarding selectively quoting and mistranslating verses from the *Nārada-Pāñcarātra Bharadvāja-saṁhitā* thereby misleading the devotee community into partaking of *śāstra-nindā*. In this section, we will refute these arguments and restore the proper *siddhānta*.

Out of context quotes

In his attempt to paint the *Nārada-Pāñcarātra Bharadvāja-saṁhitā* as a scripture not suitable for ISKCON, through questionable translation and by quoting its verses out of context, the author misinterprets verses from the scripture. An example from the book is cited below:

For a sample, look no further than Bhāradvāja-saṁhitā itself. There in verses 1.61-62 Bharadvāja Muni makes a blanket statement about conditioned souls who, due to their beginningless sinful inclinations and resultant births into sinful families, sinful communities, or sinful countries, or at inauspicious times, cannot develop remembrance of, surrender to, or servitude toward Lord Viṣṇu, or Keśava: – pages 11

Our refutations

In his translations of verses 1.61 and 1.62 of *Bharadvāja-saṁhitā*, the author states that Bharadvāja Muni makes a blanket

statement about sinful conditioned souls that they cannot ever develop remembrance of or servitude towards Lord Viṣṇu, which is not an accurate translation. The actual translations based on authentic commentary by vaiṣṇavas for the verses Np-Bs 1.61 and 1.62 are cited below:

anāder vāsanā-yogād viparītād ihātmanaḥ smṛtir na jāyate viṣṇau kuta evārpaṇe matiḥ: “From time immemorial conditioned souls in this world are addicted to sense gratification which is opposed to their real self-interest. This prevents them from even remembering Lord Viṣṇu, what to speak of understanding the necessity of surrendering to Him.” [NP-BS 1.61]

sva-pāpa-saṁbhavād eva kulāt saṁsargato 'nyataḥ deśāt kālāt svabhāvāc ca prapadyante na keśavam: “People do not surrender to Lord Keśava (1) because of the influence of their sinful reactions, (2) because of being born in atheistic families, (3) as a result of associating with non-devotees, (4) due to unfavorable time, place, and circumstances, and (5) because of their demoniac nature.” [NP-BS 1.62]

The author’s accusation that Np-Bs verses 1.61 and 1.62 are not suitable for ISKCON, due to their discrimination against people of a western origin is ludicrous. Such interpretations are akin to rejecting the entire Bhagavad-gītā because one of its verses 7.15 promotes racism and casteism – permanently denying people born in the western countries any chance at surrendering to the Lord because their origin makes them grossly foolish (spiritually), lowest among mankind (*mlechhās* and *yavanās*), whose knowledge is stolen by illusion, and who partake of the atheistic nature of demons.

Using the same logic should we reject Lord Brahmā as a racist since in SB 10.2.32 (*ye 'nye 'ravindākṣa... āruhya kṛcchreṇa*) he states that non-devotees, who may be very learned, are fallen and have no chance of liberation since they disregard the Lord’s lotus feet? All these examples show that the author’s interpretation of Np-Bs verses 1.61 and 1.62 is certainly prejudiced and a total misrepresentation of that scripture.

Half hen logic - “good” and “bad” verses

In his continued attempt to deride the *Nārada-Pāñcarātra Bharadvāja-saṁhitā* (NP-BS) as a scripture not suitable for ISKCON, the author adopts the half-hen logic of choosing verses that favor his narrative and rejecting other verses that are unfavorable. In one of the previous sections, we presented a hint to the author’s half hen logic in regards *Nārada-Pāñcarātra’s Bharadvāja-saṁhitā*, wherein he accepted verses Np-Bs 3.22-25 because those verses are favorable to his arguments, whereas he verses 1.42-44 of the same scripture are rejected by the author because they prohibit FDGs. On page 25-26 of his book, the author tries to link the Np-Bs verses 1.59 and 1.60 with reference to the FDGs of Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura’s *dikṣā* lineage, which serves as another example for his half-hen logic, as cited below:

We should note that BS 1.59-60 says, in effect that unless you are ready to accept these three Gosvāmīnīs as siddhas, the entire *dikṣā* lineage of Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura starting from them is bogus and useless, as all the consecutive ācāryas after them in his line were not properly initiated, and the three Gosvāmīnīs themselves were foolish and fallen—p 25, 26

Our refutations:

The author has carefully neglected the Np-Bs verses 1.42-44 which state that only women who are at the *pratyakṣitātmanātha* (*siddha*) level, can become *ācāryas*. Np-Bs 1.59-60 merely states the repercussions of violating the rules set by Np-Bs 1.42-44. The author is guilty of presenting a straw-man argument of raising the status of the three Gosvāmīnīs of the *dikṣā* lineage of Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura issue which is not the topic of discussion. We are discussing the relevance of the *Bhāradvāja-saṁhitā*’s verses to ISKCON particularly in regards to *vaiṣṇava-dikṣā* based on *Nārada-Pāñcarātra* and not about the validity of the *dikṣā* lineage of Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura which is based on *siddha-pranāṇī dikṣā* system. Hence whether or not three Gosvāmīnīs are *siddhas* is irrelevant as far as the verse 1.59-60

is concerned. The validity of the *siddha-pranāṇī* and the *dīkṣā* lineage of Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura has already been discussed in detail in prior sections of this writing.

The context presented by the author in the previous argument to discredit the *Bhāradvāja-saṁhitā*'s verses has been proven to be a straw-man fallacy. Nonetheless, Np-Bs verses 1.17-19³⁶ regarding *prapatti-yoga* (the act of total surrender) list the six limbs of surrender akin to the most famous *śloka* which discusses surrender (“*ānukūlyasya saṅkalpam...*”), widely preached by Śrīla Prabhupāda and described in *Hari-bhakti-vilāsa* (and Cc *Madhya* 22.100). The *Bhāradvāja Saṁhitā* not only mentions this *śloka* in chapter 1 but also explains each one of the six limbs in detail in other chapters and thus it is uniquely connected to *Vaiṣṇava* philosophy, in particular it is relevant to Gauḍīya-vaiṣṇavas. So far, we have seen that in extracting and quoting out of context, and assigning subjective and speculative meanings to *Bhāradvāja-saṁhitā* verses, such as 1.59 – 62, the author is diverting the attention of the readers away from the real point that the *Bhāradvāja Saṁhitā* is very much applicable to ISKCON since it was recommended by Śrīla Prabhupāda and his predecessor *ācāryas* of the *Gauḍīya-vaiṣṇava-sampradāya*. Therefore, the author is guilty of indulging in the Red-Herring fallacy, which is to intentionally distract the attention of the audience away from the main theme of discussion.

Half hen logic - Bhāradvāja-saṁhitā “useful” or “useless”

On page 31 of his book, the author states:

Siddha-praṇālī is as much a *pāñcarātrikī* process as ātmīya-bhara-nyāsa of *Bhāradvāja-saṁhitā*. And the reason why it is not practiced in ISKCON is because it was not introduced by Śrīla Prabhupāda — just like *Bhāradvāja-saṁhitā* wasn't. – [p 31]

36 “*prapattir ānukūlyasya saṅkalpo 'pratikūlatā viśvāso varaṇaṁ nyāsaḥ kārpaṇyam iti ṣaḍ-vidhā kṛtānukūlyasya-saṅkalpaḥ prātikūlyam vivarjayet viśvāsaśālī kṛpaṇaḥ prārthayan rakṣaṇaṁ prati ātmānaṁ nīkṣipati yad vipra-devasya pādayoḥ sā prapattir iyaṁ sadyaḥ sarva-pāpa-pramocanī*”

Our refutations:

Throughout his book, the author has criticized the *pāñcarātrikī* process of *ātmīya-bhara-nyāsa* of *Bhāradvāja-saṁhitā* but all of a sudden, he finds that process to be authentic because it suits his convenience of defending the *siddha-praṇālī* process. The author accused his opposition of venturing outside of Śrīla Prabhupāda’s teachings only to repeat the same himself while trying to defend the *siddha-praṇālī* initiation practices. If this is not an example of half-hen logic what is?

We like to remind our readers that in “Nectar of Devotion,” chapter 16, Śrīla Prabhupāda clearly states his reservations against the system of *siddha-praṇālī* initiation. The author’s claim that *siddha-praṇālī* initiation is nearly identical to the *pāñcarātrikī* process (*ātmīya-bhara-nyāsa*) presented in the *Bhāradvāja-saṁhitā* is certainly disputable. For example, Śrīla Prabhupāda endorsed the *pāñcarātrikī* process of purification (*pañca-saṁskāra*), as the method of ISKCON dikṣā³⁷ and not *siddha-praṇālī* practices based on the *rāgānuga-mārga*. On the contrary, the author’s claim that Śrīla Prabhupāda did not introduce *siddha-praṇālī*, for the same reasons that he did not introduce the *Bhāradvāja-saṁhitā*, is preposterous because Śrīla Prabhupāda’s teachings in the purport to SB 4.31.10 certainly guides us to the *Bhāradvāja-saṁhitā*, which contains numerous details regarding the *pāñcarātrikī* method of initiations.

Half hen logic – Is Sunīti a disposable?

Throughout his book the author and his camp have severely criticized queen Sunīti as vengeful and angry, and that her character traits are hardly suitable for a *patha-pradarśaka-guru*, certainly not for a *śikṣā-guru* and especially not for a *dikṣā-guru*. This is an example of ad hominem fallacy on the part of the author displaying offensive attitude towards Sunīti, just to distract the focus away from the SB 4.12.32 purport. However,

37 “Our Kṛṣṇa consciousness movement adopts this *pāñcarātrika-vidhi*, ...” – [SB 4.31.10 purport]

we do find on page 64 of his book that the author has something different to say regarding Sunīti (emphasis ours):

However, giving worldly trivial moral or ethical instructions is not exactly what qualifies one for being a śikṣā-guru in the Vaiṣṇava sense. Something else does:

“There are two kinds of instructing spiritual masters. One is the liberated person fully absorbed in meditation in devotional service, and **the other is he who invokes the disciple’s spiritual consciousness by means of relevant instructions.** ...thus awakens him to the activities of devotional service.” (Cc *Adi* 1.47 purp.)

This is what Sunīti did as she invoked Dhruva’s “spiritual consciousness by means of relevant instructions”. Her instructions to him were not “secondary, non-essential instruction on the good and bad,” as is the scope of instructions permitted to be given by women and śūdras in BS 1.43. – page 64
So now what happened to the author’s ideas expressed in Appendix-2 on pages 211 to 214 of his book that characterizes Sunīti as (emphasis ours):

This is another part of point 5, in which I cite **Jiva Gosvami in Bhakti-sandarbha 203, where he defines a siksa-guru** by his ability to enlighten people afflicted by such emotions as anger: “The speaker is the best guru if he enlightens people filled with lust and anger, misers and depressed persons when they hear him.” (translation by Bhanu Swami: *kāma-krodhādi-yukto’pi kṛpaṇo’pi viṣādavān | śrutvā vikāśam āyāti sa vaktā paramo guruḥ ||*) The fact, however that Dhruva was still afflicted by anger and vengeance on the way to the forest **indicates that Suniti was not able to free him from anger by her instructions, or maybe didn’t actually intend to.** – pages 212 and 213

So, what changed between pages 64 and 213 that caused such a big shift in the author’s mood and his opinion about Sunīti to make her fall (in his mind) from her position of *śikṣā-guru*? How can the author whimsically consider Sunīti as the one who invoked Dhruva’s spiritual consciousness by means of

relevant instructions when it is convenient for him and at the same time when it is not convenient, the author accuses her of being incompetent for not being able to free Dhruva Mahārāja from anger by her instructions? Alternatively, is it that the author reserves the right to conveniently quote Jiva Gosvami and Śrīla Prabhupāda if and when he finds a need to use their words in order to achieve his own objectives? Either way, this is the evidence that proves that the author is the expert at *ardha-kukkuṭi-nyāya* (half-hen logic).

Other objections against Bhāradvāja-saṁhitā

On page 22 of his book, the author criticizes the anti-FDG camp's explanation for the Np-Bs verses 1.42-44, as cited below:

The interpretation of Np-Bs 1.42-44 that women must be residents of Goloka to initiate, while śūdras and *antyajas* can initiate as *sādhakas* — or, conversely that *sādhakas* can initiate while being classified as śūdras and *antyajas* — is entirely novel and unprecedented in the history and tenets of any traditional Indian Vaiṣṇava school. – page 22

Our refutations:

So, these are not the anti-FDG camp's interpretations but they are a paraphrase of what Śrīla Prabhupāda had stated in his teachings, as cited below:

The answer to your Istagosthi questions are as follows: Unless one is a resident of Krishna Loka, one cannot be a Spiritual Master. That is the first proposition. – [letter to Mukunda, 10 June 1969, New Vrindavan]

A person who is liberated acharya and guru cannot commit any mistake but there are persons who are less qualified or not liberated but still can act as guru and acharya by strictly following the disciplic succession. – [letter to Janārdana, 26 April 1968, New York]

Basically, the author is raising the question: why can less than perfect or non-siddha *śūdras* and *antyajas* initiate whereas a woman unless on siddha platform cannot initiate?

The answer is that a woman cannot circumvent *liṅga-bhedam* (gender differences) and *stri-dharma* (cannot be independent at any time) unless they are at the *pratyakṣitātma-nātha* level to become *dīkṣā-gurus*. Whereas, men (*śūdras* and *antyajas*), even if they are *sādhakas*, can elevate themselves to the level of *sattva-guṇa* through the *pāñcarātrikī* process whereas women cannot be elevated to *sattva-guṇa* as stated by Śrīla Prabhupāda:

Woman, they are generally equipped with the qualities of passion and ignorance. And man also may be but man can be elevated to the platform of goodness. Woman cannot be. Woman cannot be. Therefore if the husband is nice and the woman follows—woman becomes faithful and chaste to the husband—then their both life becomes successful. There are three qualities of nature: *sattva*, *raja*, *tama*. So *rajas-tama*, generally that is the quality of woman. And man can become to the platform of goodness. Therefore initiation, brahminical symbolic representation, is given to the man, not to the woman. This is the theory.

Therefore the combination should be that the husband should be first-class devotee, Kṛṣṇa conscious, and woman should be..., woman should be devoted to the husband, faithful, so that she would help the husband to make progress in Kṛṣṇa consciousness. Then their both life is successful. Otherwise, if the husband simply becomes captivated by the charming beauty of woman and engages himself in the sex life, then his life is lost, and the woman, they are less intelligent that unless they are guided by proper husband, her life is also lost – [lecture, SB 1.3.17—September 22, 1972, Los Angeles]

This is the system that Śrīla Prabhupāda gave for ISKCON based on *guru-sādhū-sāstras*, yet the author in his zeal to implement FDG at any cost deride these Vedic systems and Vedic traditions by avoiding direct meanings and adopting indirect twisted meanings. On page 134 of his book, the author poses further questions, as cited below:

Q3: Throughout its Chapter 1, *Bhāradvāja-saṁhitā* makes no reference to the Lord as Kṛṣṇa,

Q4: to His abode as Goloka Vrndavana, or to one's devotional mood toward Him as anything except service (dāsyā)

Q5: nor does it give you any grounds to fully equate its process of bhakti (described as nyāsa, prapatti, or ātmīya-bhara-nyāsa) with that of Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu. – page 134

Our refutations:

Answer to Q3: The *Bhāradvāja-saṁhitā* refers to Lord by many names in many verses, as listed herein: In chapter one of the *Bhāradvāja-saṁhitā*, the Lord is explicitly referred to as Kṛṣṇa (*jāyate kṛṣṇa-vartmani* 1.34), Nārāyaṇa (*lakṣmīse* 1.9, 11, 63), Viṣṇu (1.10, 61, 64, 74, 93), Hari (*harim śaraṇam āśrayet* 1.13, 27, 30, 31, 56, 65, 87, 88), Acyuta (1.15), Janārdana (1.58), Keśava (1.62, 66), Vāsudeva (1.67), Madhusūdana (1.99) and by many other names in it's other chapters.

Answer to Q4: His abode is the ocean of infinite energies, infinite knowledge, source of all auspiciousness (*ananta-jñāna-śakty-ādi-kalyāṇa-guṇa-sāgare pare brahmaṇi*) and is filled with desire trees that fulfill the desires of devotees with variegated devotional moods (*sarva-siddhi-kṛt*) [NP-BS 1.9, 1.68].

Answer to Q5: The Np-Bs Verse 1.27 defines *prapatti* as giving up all material desires (*parityajyākhilān kāmān*), having a mood of unalloyed devotional service (*bhaktyaivātmeśvaram*), and desiring to exclusively become Lord's servant (*prapadyate dāsyā-ratir*). Is this verse not equivalent to verse 1.1.11 from *Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu*?³⁸ Moreover, in Cc *Madhya* 19.169, the *pāñcarātri*ka scriptures (of which the *Bhāradvāja-saṁhitā* is an integral part) and *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* are cited as the sources of Vedic literatures that describes the activities and processes of rendering *śuddha-bhakti*, pure devotional service, by which one develops his original love for Kṛṣṇa in due course of time.³⁹

38 *anyābhilāṣitā-śūnyaṁ jñāna-karmādy-anāvṛtam ānukūlyena kṛṣṇānu- śīlanam bhaktir uttamā* [BRS 1.1.11]

39 *ei 'śuddha-bhakti' – ihā haite 'premā' haya; pañcarātre, bhāgavate ei lakṣaṇa kaya* [Cc *Madhya*, 19.169]

NP-BS verses 1.30-31 present *prapatti* practices containing *nava-vidha-bhakti* (the nine processes of bhakti) such as paying obeisances [*praṇāma*], *śravaṇa*, *kīrtana*, *smaraṇa*, etc. By throwing oneself fully into the service of Lord Hari [full surrender], even though just one of these nine processes, one will achieve complete liberation from material bondage, as will many past and future generations of one's family.⁴⁰ Are these verses not conveying the same messages that are conveyed in SB 7.5.23-24, *Padyāvalī* (53), and the *Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu* (1.2.265)?

Concluding Remarks

We have not attempted to refute Madan Mohan Prabhu's book, "Guru: The principle not the body," line by line but have only highlighted important glaring points. It has been established that the author does not accept *śāstra* as the center of all, which Śrīla Prabhupāda emphasized time and again in all forms of his teachings of which books form the basis. We have also shown that in the name of loyalty to Śrīla Prabhupāda there are severe misunderstandings of Vedic hermeneutics on the author's part that causes him to use Śrīla Prabhupāda's teachings when convenient and reject or interpret the teachings in whimsical ways when those teachings are inconvenient or unfavorable.

We have established by providing scriptural evidence and other evidence from *sādhū-vākyās* and *guru-vākyās* based on *śāstra-vākyās*, that the institutionalization of FDGs is not sanctioned in the *vaidika* or *pāñcarātrikī* scriptures. However, in the name of preaching, the pro-FDG camp succeeded in the institutionalization of the FDG without caring to discuss the *pāñcarātrikī* scriptural regulations on FDG, which is only akin to the saying: operation success patient dead.

40 'eka' aṅge siddhi pāila bahu bhakta-gaṇa ambarīṣādi bhaktera 'bahu' aṅga-sādhana [Cc *Madhya*, 22.135]

kāma tyaji' kṛṣṇa bhaje śāstra-ājñā māni' deva-ṛṣi-pitrādikera kabhu nahe ṛṇi [Cc *Madhya*, 22.140]

Refuting other pro-FDG arguments

Kṛṣṇa-tattva-vetta, FDG Institution, and Gender equality

Who is a Kṛṣṇa-tattva-vetta?	313
Kṛṣṇa-tattva-vetta and Bhāgavata-dharma.....	313
A Kṛṣṇa-tattva-vetta must be an Āryan.....	314
A Kṛṣṇa-tattva-vetta adheres to śāstric injunctions.....	315
More contentions/FAQ	316
FDG Institutionalization concept - refuted	316
Śrīla Prabhupāda's letter to Hansadutta - Answered.....	316
FDG Institutionalization – refuted	317
FDG is not valid but VDG is valid - Answered	319
Gender equality argument - refuted	320
FAQ on the “Sunīti argument” [SB 4.12.32 purport]	322
In the caste-by-birth system were women initiated?	322
Sunīti could not perform the yuga-dharma, so can she be a guru?	323

Who is a Kṛṣṇa-tattva-vetta?

In this section, we will analyze the various aspects of Śrī Caitanya Mahāhāprabhu's *kibā vipra* (Cc. *Madhya* 8.128) verse point by point. As a matter of fact, in Śrīla Prabhupāda's purport to SB 6.16.43, he conclusively and holistically gives answers to the majority of the questions related to Cc. *Madhya* 8.128 raised by the pro-FDG camp. We will now analyze and summarize the SB 6.16.43 purport for a deeper understanding of what it means to be a follower of *Bhāgavata-dharma* or *Kṛṣṇa-tattva-vetta* and we request the readers to specifically note the text in emphasis.

Kṛṣṇa-tattva-vetta and Bhāgavata-dharma

First and foremost, we have to understand that *Kṛṣṇa-tattva-vetta* refers to one who knows and understands *kṛṣṇa-kathā* perfectly and preaches *kṛṣṇa-kathā* in adherence with scriptural injunctions. Such a person must be a strict follower of *Bhāgavata-dharma*. Furthermore, following *bhāgavata-dharma* is the same as following *varṇāśrama-dharma*, a social structure that functions for the exclusive pleasure of Lord Kṛṣṇa or Lord Viṣṇu. As stated by Śrīla Prabhupāda (our addition in square brackets) in his purport to SB 6.16.43, a *Kṛṣṇa-tattva-vetta* preaches *Kṛṣṇa-kathā* to everyone to help them become Kṛṣṇa conscious by following *bhāgavata-dharma* or *daiva-varṇāśrama-dharma*:

Bhāgavata-dharma and *kṛṣṇa-kathā* are identical. Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu wanted everyone to become a *guru* [jei *kṛṣṇa tattva vettā*, sei *guru hoi*] and preach the instructions of Kṛṣṇa [*kṛṣṇa-kathā*] everywhere from *Bhagavad-gītā*, *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, the *Purāṇas*, *Vedānta-sūtra* and similar Vedic literatures. Āryans, who are advanced in civilization, follow *bhāgavata-dharma*. Prahlāda Mahārāja, although merely a child of five years, recommended:

*kaumāra ācaret prājño dharmān bhāgavatān iha
durlabhaṁ mānuṣaṁ janma tad apy adhruvam arthadam*

Prahlāda Mahārāja preached bhāgavata-dharma among his classmates as soon as an opportunity was afforded by the

absence of his teachers from the classroom. He said that from the very beginning of life, from the age of five, children should be instructed about *bhāgavata-dharma* because the human form of life, which is very rarely obtained, is meant for understanding this subject. (SB 7.6.1)

Bhāgavata-dharma means living according to the instructions of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. In *Bhagavad-gītā*, we find that the Supreme Lord has arranged human society into four social divisions, namely *brāhmaṇa*, *kṣatriya*, *vaiśya*, and *śūdra*. Again, the *Purāṇas* and other Vedic literature set forth four āśramas, which are the divisions of spiritual life. **Therefore bhāgavata-dharma means the varṇāśrama-dharma of the four social and four spiritual divisions.**¹

A Kṛṣṇa-tattva-vetta must be an Āryan

Śrīla Prabhupāda further explains in the subsequent paragraphs of the purport to SB 6.16.43 that the real meaning of a *Kṛṣṇa-tattva-vetta* or a follower of *bhāgavata-dharma* is to become a member of the Āryan civilization of learned persons which is divided into four classes of men and four orders of society. In other words, he states that an Āryan civilization must be organized into a *daiva-varṇāśrama* society that acts only for the pleasure of the Lord:

The members of human society who strictly follow the principles of *bhāgavata-dharma* and live according to the instructions of the Supreme Personality of Godhead are called Āryans or ārya. A civilization of Āryans who strictly follow the instructions of the Lord and never deviate from those instructions is perfect. ... As stated here, *sthira-cara-sattva-kadambeṣv aprthag-dhiyaḥ*. The word *aprthag-dhiyaḥ* indicates that Āryans does not distinguish between lower and higher grades of life. All life should be protected. All living beings have a right to live, even the trees and plants. This is the basic principle of an Āryan civilization. Apart from the lower living entities, those who have come to the platform of human civilization should be divided into a society of

¹ <https://tinyurl.com/47d29nvu>

brāhmaṇas, *kṣatriyas*, *vaiśyas*, and *śūdras*. The *brāhmaṇas* should follow the instructions of the Supreme Personality of Godhead as stated in *Bhagavad-gītā* and other Vedic literature. The criterion must be *guṇa* and *karma*. In other words, one should acquire the qualities of a *brāhmaṇa*, *kṣatriya*, *vaiśya*, or *śūdra* and act accordingly. **This is the civilization accepted by the Āryans. Why do they accept it? They accept it because they are very much eager to satisfy Kṛṣṇa. This is a perfect civilization.**

A Kṛṣṇa-tattva-vetta adheres to śāstric injunctions

Continuing with the purport to SB 6.16.43 we find that Śrīla Prabhupāda further elaborates that as a member of Āryan civilization a *Kṛṣṇa-tattva-vetta* is fully convinced of all instructions of the Lord without a tinge of the doubt and preaches and follows those injunctions without any deviation:

Āryans do not deviate from the instructions of Kṛṣṇa, nor do they have doubts about Kṛṣṇa but non-Āryans and other demoniac people fail to follow the instructions of *Bhagavad-gītā* and *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*. This is because they have been trained in sense gratification at the cost of all other living entities. *Nūnaṁ pramattaḥ kurute vikarma*: their only business is to indulge in all kinds of forbidden activities for sense gratification. *Yad indriya-prītaya āprṇoti*: they deviate in this way because they want to gratify their senses. They have no other occupation or ambition. Their method of civilization is condemned in the previous verse. *Kaḥ kṣemo nija-parayoḥ kiyān vārthaḥ sva-para-druhā dharmeṇa*: “What is the meaning of a civilization that kills oneself and others?”

This verse, therefore, advises that everyone become a member of the Āryan civilization and accept the instructions of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. One should conduct his social, political, and religious affairs according to His instructions. We are spreading the Kṛṣṇa consciousness movement to try to establish a society the way that Kṛṣṇa wants it. This is the meaning of Kṛṣṇa consciousness. [SB 6.16.43 purport]

To Continue Reading...

Click the Button Below And

Get Online PDF Access To the

Full Version of This Book

Only Rs.50

Or

[Buy the Hard Copy Here](#)

(Rs. 300)